



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,343	07/02/2002	Ilia Greenblat	56162.000387	8344

21967 7590 07/01/2005

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

BHATIA, AJAY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/064,343

Applicant(s)

GREENBLAT, ILIA

Examiner

Ajay M. Bhatia

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected:
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/3/03.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2145

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) as follows:

This application is claiming the benefit of a prior filed nonprovisional application under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c). Copendency between the current application and the prior application is required.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2145

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. MTU and RTU are claimed but they are insufficiently described as to their composition, implementation, operation or connection to claimed invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "PHY neutral" in line 2. The claim does not provide sufficient information to full interpret the mean of this claim examiner has treaded the claim to the best of his abilities.

The term "ultrafast" in claim 6 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term " ultrafast " is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Ultrafast is not proper grammatically and does not define a quantifiable quantity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Langrind et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0120822).

For claim 1, Langrind teaches, a communications processor implemented on a chip,
comprising:

a network processor including means for processing a plurality of protocols
including ATM, frame relay, Ethernet, and IP, said means being programmable using a
set of library commands to process additional protocols;

a protocol processor for controlling the network processor;

wherein the protocol processor performs control plane processing and the
network processor performs data plane processing; and

wherein the network processor and the protocol processor are members on at
least one network, and further comprising a plurality of other members on the at least
one network. (see Langrind, paragraphs 8,9,10,150,151,153,220,849,947)

Langrind fails to clearly disclose a ring network,

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to define Langrid network as a ring network because SONET networks are typically implemented as a ring network.

For claim 2, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the network processor includes a plurality of compounds that share a single ring interface to the ring network. (see Langrind, paragraphs 107,106)

For claim 3, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the communications processor is PHY neutral. (see Langrind, paragraphs 71,72)

For claim 4, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the at least one ring network comprises multiple ring networks including a protocol processor ring network and a network processor ring network. (see Langrind, paragraph 266)

For claim 5, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 4, where the network processor ring network includes a first network processor for transmitting packets and a second network processor for receiving packets. (see Langrind, paragraph 187)

For claim 6, Langrind teaches, the communication processor of claim 1, wherein the network processor includes ultrafast task switching using active registers for current

tasks and shadow registers for preloading next tasks. (see Langrind, paragraphs 106,107)

For claim 7, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, further comprising multiple DMA controllers for access to external memories. (see Langrind, paragraph 107)

For claim 8, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the protocol processor is adapted to perform the following:

- signaling protocols;
- protocol management;
- exception handling; and
- system configuration and control.

(see Langrind, paragraphs 106,107)

For claim 9, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the network processor is adapted to perform the following:

- per-packet processing;
- packet forwarding;
- packet classification;
- quality-of-service handling; and
- packet reformatting.

Art Unit: 2145

(see Langrind, paragraphs 187,188)

For claim 10, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the control path protocol support is provided by the protocol processor and the data path protocol support is provided by the network processor. (see Langrind, paragraphs 139,188)

For claim 11, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the network processor performs zero overhead task switching. (see Langrind, paragraphs 106,107)

For claim 12, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the network processor includes compound modules operating as parallel engines. (see Langrind, paragraphs 120)

For claim 13, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the communications processor is implemented to provide an enterprise integrated access device (EIAD). (see Langrind, paragraphs 150,166)

For claim 14, Langrind fails to clearly disclose, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the communications processor is implemented to provide a multi-tenant unit (MTU) or remote terminal unit (RTU). (see Langrind, paragraphs 106,115)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the system of Langrid and the use of either a MTU or RTU, since it is well known in the art to monitor the network using a RTU. Official Notice is taken.

For claim 15, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the communications processor is implemented to provide a media gateway. (see Langrind, paragraphs 122, 143)

For claim 16, Langrind teaches, the communications processor of claim 1, wherein the communications processor is implemented to provide a voice gateway. (see Langrind, paragraphs 622, 673)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached UPSTO 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia M Wallace can be reached on (571)-272-6159. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2145

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB


VALENCIA MARTIN-WALLACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER